1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
3			
4	HONORABLE THOMAS J. WHELAN		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE PRESIDING		
6	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )		
7	PLAINTIFF, )		
8	VS. )NO. 10CR1372W		
9	JONATHAN LEAL-DEL CARMEN, ) DOMINGO GOMEZ-AGUILAR, )		
10	DOMINGO GOMEZ-AGUILAR, )  DEFENDANTS. )		
11			
12			
13	MOTION HEARING		
14	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  AUGUST 30, 2010		
15	SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA		
16			
17	MELISSA A. PIERSON, CSR 12499, RPR		
18	FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER 940 FRONT STREET, ROOM 3155		
19	SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101 PH: (619)702-7508		
20	PIERSON1121@SBCGLOBAL.NET		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:		
2	ON BEHALF	OF PLAINTIFF: LAURA DUFFY UNITED STATES ATTORNEY BY: MR. STEVE MILLER, ESQ.	
3			
4		ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS 880 FRONT STREET	
5		FIFTH FLOOR SAN DIEGO, CA 92101	
6		SAN DIEGO, CA 92101	
7	ON BEHALF	OF DEFENDANT LEAL-DEL CARMEN: FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF SAN DIEGO	
8		BY: MR. HANNI FAKHOURY, ESQ. 225 W. BROADWAY ST. 900	
10		SAN DIEGO, CA 92101 (619) 234-8467	
11	ON BEHALF	OF DEFENDANT GOMEZ: MR. ROBERT CARRIEDO, ESQ. 105 W. "F" STREET ST. 300 SAN DIEGO, CA 92101 (619) 232-0900	
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1 MADAM CLERK: CASE NO. 10CR1372, UNITED STATES OF 2 AMERICA VERSUS JONATHAN LEAL-DEL CARMEN AND DOMINIGO GOMEZ-AGUILAR. MR. FAKHOURY: GOOD AFTERNOON, AGAIN, YOUR HONOR, 4 HANNI FAKHOURY, FEDERAL DEFENDERS, ON BEHALF OF MR. LEAL-DEL 5 CARMEN. 6 7 THE COURT: GOOD AFTERNOON. MR. CARRIEDO: GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR, ROBERT 8 9 CARRIEDO ON BEHALF OF DOMINGO GOMEZ-AGUILAR. HE SHOULD BE 10 HERE SHORTLY. THE COURT: GOOD AFTERNOON. 11 12 MR. MILLER: STEVE MILLER FOR THE UNITED STATES. 13 THE COURT: GOOD AFTERNOON. 14 MR. MILLER: GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR. 15 MR. FAKHOURY: YOUR HONOR, MR. LEAL-DEL CARMEN IS PRESENT IN COURT. HE IS THE INDIVIDUAL WITH THE MUSTACHE, TO 16 17 YOUR HONOR'S RIGHT. 18 THE COURT: THANK YOU. 19 MR. CARRIEDO: YOUR HONOR, MR. GOMEZ IS ALSO 20 PRESENT. HE IS USING THE SERVICES OF THE SPANISH LANGUAGE 21 INTERPRETER AS WELL. 22 THE COURT: BOTH DEFENDANTS ARE BEING SO ASSISTED. 23 ALL RIGHT, THIS MATTER IS ON CALENDAR FOR A MOTION HEARING. 24 IN THAT REGARD THE RECORD CAN REFLECT THAT I HAVE READ AND 25 CONSIDERED THE DEFENSE'S MOVING PAPERS, INCLUDING THE

DECLARATION OF MR. LEAL-DEL CARMEN. I HAVE READ AND

CONSIDERED THE GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE, BOTH RESPONSES, I

SHOULD SAY.

STARTING WITH DOCKET NO. 21-1, THAT'S THE MOTION FOR DISCOVERY. THERE DON'T APPEAR TO BE ANY ISSUES YOU NEED ME TO RESOLVE.

MR. FAKHOURY: THERE IS ONE ISSUE, YOUR HONOR.
THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. FAKHOURY: I MISSPOKE, THERE ARE TWO ISSUES.

THE FIRST ISSUE THERE WAS A MATERIAL WITNESS DEPOSITION IN

THIS CASE, YOUR HONOR. THE MATERIAL WITNESSES WERE DEPOSED,

AND IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING THAT MR. MILLER HAS RECEIVED A COPY

OF THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE DEPOSITION. HE HADN'T TURNED IT

OVER. WE HAVE HAD A LITTLE BIT OF A DISPUTE WHETHER HE IS

OBLIGATED TO TURN IT OVER. I AM MAKING A REQUEST THAT HE

TURN OVER, THROUGH DISCOVERY MEANS, THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE

MATERIAL WITNESS DEPOSITION, SPECIFICALLY UNDER RULE

16(A)(1)(E)(2), WHICH SAYS THAT UPON A DEFENDANT'S REQUEST,

GOVERNMENT MUST PERMIT THE DEFENDANT TO INSPECT AND TO COPY

OR PHOTOGRAPH DOCUMENTS, ETC., AND THE GOVERNMENT INTENDS TO

USE THE ITEM IN ITS CASE-IN-CHIEF AT TRIAL.

GIVEN THAT THE DEPOSITION WOULD BE THE TESTIMONY OF
TWO WITNESSES WHO ARE NO LONGER PRESENT BECAUSE THEY HAVE
BEEN RELEASED AND RETURNED, I AM MAKING A SPECIFIC REQUEST
UNDER RULE 16 FOR THE DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT TO BE TURNED OVER

1 BY MR. MILLER. THAT'S THE FIRST ISSUE, AND I DON'T KNOW IF THE COURT --2 3 THE COURT: LET ME HEAR FROM MR. MILLER ON THAT ONE 4 FIRST. 5 MR. MILLER: I WILL DO WHAT THIS COURT TELLS ME, HOWEVER, CUSTOM IN THE PAST HAS BEEN WHEN THERE IS A 6 7 DEPOSITION AND THERE IS A COST OF TRANSCRIPTS, BOTH PARTIES 8 BEAR THE COST OF THOSE TRANSCRIPTS. AND THE CASE OF THE 9 DEPOSITION, THE GOVERNMENT BEARS THE COST OF THE ORIGINALS, 10 AND THE DEFENSE BEARS THE COST OF THE COPIES. THIS IS REALLY A MATTER OF COMMERCIAL PROTOCOL. I 11 12 HESITATED TO TURN OVER COPIES OF THE DEPOSITION OUT OF 13 RESPECT FOR THE COURT REPORTER, WHO USES THIS AS A COMMERCIAL 14 VENTURE. 15 I HAVE HAD A CASE IN THE PAST WHERE THE SAME REQUEST WAS MADE IN ORDER FOR THE FEDERAL DEFENDERS TO OBTAIN 16 17 A FREE COPY OF THE MATERIAL WITNESS DEPOSITIONS, AND I WAS 18 INFORMED THAT THIS ISSUE IS SORT OF ONE THAT'S COMING TO A 19 HEAD IN HAVING SOME KIND OF BUTTING OF HEADS BECAUSE OF 20 BUDGETARY CONSTRAINTS FOR THE FEDERAL DEFENDERS WHERE THE DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL DEFENDERS HAS MADE A DECISION TO 21 22 PRESS THIS ISSUE EVERY TIME THE FEDERAL DEFENDERS HAS TO OBTAIN A COPY OF THE DEPOSITION ORDERS. 23 24 JUST AS A MATTER OF WHAT I UNDERSTAND THE PROCEDURE

TO BE FOR COURT REPORTERS WHO ARE PAID TO PREPARE THE

25

TRANSCRIPTS --

THE COURT: WELL, IT'S MY OPINION IT'S NOT

APPROPRIATE FOR YOUR OFFICE TO COPY THE DEPOSITION AND TURN

IT OVER BECAUSE, AS YOU INDICATED, THAT DOES AFFECT THE

LIVELIHOOD OF THE COURT REPORTERS. AS LONG AS THE MATERIAL

IS READILY AVAILABLE TO MR. FAKHOURY AND HE CAN REQUEST A

COPY, SINCE YOU ALREADY PAID FOR THE ORIGINAL, YOU PAID THE

HIGHEST PRICE, HIS OFFICE CAN PAY THE COPY PRICE AND RETAIN

THEIR OWN COPY. MR. FAKHOURY, FROM THAT STANDPOINT, YOUR

REQUEST IS DENIED.

WHAT'S THE OTHER ISSUE?

MR. FAKHOURY: THE OTHER ISSUE, YOUR HONOR, IS
RELATED TO THE MOTION REGARDING DEPORTATION OF MS. GARCIAGARCIA, ANOTHER MATERIAL WITNESS. I HAD FILED, IN ADDITION
TO THE PAPERS REGARDING THIS SPECIFIC MOTION TO DISMISS, I
REQUESTED SPECIFICALLY SOME OTHER ITEMS OF DISCOVERY THAT
INCLUDES AN OPPORTUNITY TO INSPECT THE A-FILE OF ALL MATERIAL
WITNESSES, INCLUDING THOSE RETAINED AS MATERIAL WITNESSES.

TO GIVE THE COURT SOME BACKGROUND, THERE WERE THREE MATERIAL WITNESSES RETAINED, AND THERE WERE, I BELIEVE, NINE THAT WERE ULTIMATELY RELEASED TO MEXICO AND NOT DETAINED AS MATERIAL WITNESSES. I'M ASKING FOR ONE, AN OPPORTUNITY TO INSPECT AND EXAMINE ALL OF THE A-FILES OF RETAINED AND UNRETAINED MATERIAL WITNESSES.

SECONDLY, I RECEIVED VIDEO FROM MS. GARCIA-GARCIA'S

1 STATEMENT, EVEN THOUGH SHE WAS NOT RETAINED AS A MATERIAL 2 WITNESS, AND RECEIVED THE VIDEO STATEMENTS OF THREE MATERIAL WITNESSES THAT WERE RETAINED, BUT I HAVE RECEIVED VIDEO OF THE OTHER, I GUESS IT WOULD MAKE IT, EIGHT MATERIAL 4 5 WITNESSES. FORGIVE ME, MR. MILLER, IF I MISSPOKE, I THOUGHT 6 7 MR. MILLER SAID THEY MAY NOT EXIST AT ALL, BUT I'M JUST PUTTING ON THE RECORD A REQUEST IF THEY DON'T EXIST, 8 9 MR. MILLER, SAY-SO, AND END THAT. I WANT TO MAKE SURE I MADE 10 THE REQUEST ON THE RECORD. MR. MILLER: I INQUIRED ABOUT THAT SPECIFIC POINT, 11 ASKED IF THERE WERE ANY OTHER RECORDINGS, AUDIO OR VIDEO, OF 12 13 ANY OF THE OTHER MATERIAL WITNESSES, AND I WAS TOLD NO. WHAT 14 HAD HAPPENED, AND THIS IS CUSTOMARY PROCEDURE, THAT IS, WHEN 15 THEY GET A GROUP OF UNDOCUMENTED ALIENS, THEY WILL INTERVIEW ONE, VIDEO RECORD THAT PERSON, AND WHAT HAPPENED WAS BECAUSE 16 17 OF THE GENERAL NATURE OF MS. GARCIA-GARCIA'S ANSWERS, THEY 18 PLAYED IT SAFE AND GOT A MORE COMPETENT PERCEPTIVE WITNESS 19 BECAUSE SHE HAD ALREADY BEEN VIDEOTAPED. IT WAS KEPT ON THAT 20 DISK AND TURNED OVER. I HURRIED UP AND GOT COPIES OF ALL THE VIDEOS SO COUNSEL WOULD HAVE THEM BEFORE THE DEPOSITIONS, 21 22 HAVE THEM AVAILABLE. 23 THE COURT: SO, YOU TURNED OVER ALL THE EXISTING

24

25

VIDEOS?

MR. MILLER: YES.

1 THE COURT: THAT ANSWERS THAT QUESTION. 2 MR. MILLER: AS TO THAT. 3 NO OTHER RECORDINGS OF ANY OTHER STATEMENTS OF THE REMAINING EIGHT EXIST. 4 5 MR. FAKHOURY: YOUR HONOR, I APPRECIATE MR. MILLER'S COMMENTS. THE ONLY OTHER THING I WANTED TO PUT 6 7 ON THE RECORD, I CAN'T TELL WHETHER THE ISSUE OF WHETHER THE 8 STATEMENT WAS RECORDED OR UNRECORDED ASIDE, I CAN'T TELL 9 WHETHER THERE WAS ACTUALLY A STATEMENT TAKEN, EVEN IF IT WAS 10 UNRECORDED, FOR THE OTHER EIGHT MATERIAL WITNESSES. IT'S BEEN MY PRACTICE AND MY EXPERIENCE IN THESE TYPES OF CASES 11 12 THAT THEY USUALLY AT LEAST TAKE A STATEMENT FROM EVERY 13 MATERIAL WITNESS, WHETHER THEY KEEP THEM IN THE OFFICIAL, SO 14 TO SPEAK, MATERIAL WITNESS AND PULL THEM INTO THE COUNTRY OR 15 NOT TO HAVE A STATEMENT TAKEN. I THOUGHT THEY USUALLY VIDEOTAPE IT. APPARENTLY THEY DIDN'T FOR AT LEAST EIGHT OF 16 17 THESE INDIVIDUALS. BUT I HAVE NO STATEMENTS FROM THESE EIGHT INDIVIDUALS AT ALL. I WOULDN'T PRESS THE ISSUE SO MUCH, BUT 18 19 FOR THE MOTION TO DISMISS I FILED REGARDING THE DEPORTATION 20 OF MS. GARCIA-GARCIA THAT RAISED SOME RED FLAGS, IN MY 21 OPINION. 22 THE COURT: MR. MILLER, ANY STATEMENT YOU ARE AWARE 23 OF, OTHER THAN THE NON-RETAINED MATERIAL WITNESSES? 24 MR. MILLER: NONE THAT I AM AWARE OF. I CAN SPEAK 25 TO CUSTOMS, THAT IS USUALLY WHEN A GROUP OF MATERIAL

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

WITNESSES IS APPREHENDED AND THAT IF IT'S SMUGGLED, THE STATEMENTS THAT THEY TAKE ARE FOR PURPOSES OF REMOVING THOSE PARTICULAR ALIENS. AND THEN THE STATEMENTS ARE, WHAT IS YOUR CITIZENSHIP? WHERE WERE YOU BORN? WHERE WERE YOUR PARENTS BORN? DO YOU HAVE ANY DOCUMENTATION? THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. LET'S DO IT THIS WAY, I KNOW YOU TURNED OVER EVERYTHING YOU ARE AWARE OF. WOULD YOU JUST CHECK YOUR CASE AGENTS TO SEE IF THERE ARE ANY WRITTEN STATEMENTS TAKEN AND TURN THEM OVER? IF NOT, THAT'S FINE. YOU CAN'T TURN THEM OVER IF THEY DON'T EXIST. OTHERWISE YOU WILL TURN THEM OVER, FAIR ENOUGH, MR. FAKHOURY? MR. FAKHOURY: THAT'S FINE. THE COURT: MR. CASILLAS (SIC) YOU WILL GET THEM ALSO. MR. CARRIEDO: I'M SORRY? THE COURT: MR. CASILLAS WAS ON THE LAST MATTER. MR. CASILLAS: IT'S A LONG DAY. THE COURT: WITH REGARD TO DOCUMENT NO. 22, THAT'S A MOTION TO PRESERVE EVIDENCE. AT THIS POINT, MR. FAKHOURY, THAT'S OVERBROAD, SO I TEND TO DENY IT. BUT YOUR REQUEST IS ALL EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE DESTROYED, CAN BE DESTROYED. I CAN'T ISSUE AN ORDER PRESERVING ALL EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE DESTROYED. MR. FAKHOURY: PROBABLY TO MAKE IT A LITTLE MORE SPECIFIC, IT WAS MORE TOWARDS THE VIDEOTAPE, IF THEY DID

1 EXIST, ANY WRITTEN REPORTS THAT DO EXIST. IT'S MY 2 UNDERSTANDING THERE REALLY IS NOT ANY PHYSICAL SUBSTANTIVE EVIDENCE, THERE IS NO GUNS, OR DRUGS OR ANYTHING OF THAT SORT. FROM WHAT MR. MILLER SAID THERE ARE NO VIDEOTAPES THAT 4 5 EXIST AND THERE IS NOTHING TO PRESERVE. THE COURT CAN RULE ON THAT OR LEAVE IT OPEN. IF I HAVE A MORE SPECIFIC REQUEST, 6 7 IF THINGS COME TO MIND, I WILL LET THE COURT KNOW. THE COURT: I WILL DENY THAT AT THIS POINT AS MOOT. 8 9 HE HAS TURNED OVER EVERYTHING HE IS AWARE OF VIDEOTAPE WISE 10 AND STATEMENTS WISE. IF SOMETHING COMES UP, PREPARE SOMETHING, REPRESENT IT TO ME, HE WILL TURN IT OVER TO YOU. 11 12 MR. FAKHOURY: THAT'S FINE. I CAN ACCEPT THAT. 13 THANK YOU. 14 THE COURT: DOCKET NO. 21-3, DEFENSE'S MOTION TO 15 FILE FURTHER MOTIONS, MY TENTATIVE WOULD BE TO GRANT THAT PROVIDED ANY NEW MOTIONS ARE BASED ON NEWLY DISCOVERED 16 17 EVIDENCE. ANY OBJECTION TO THAT, MR. MILLER? 18 MR. MILLER: NO. 19 THE COURT: THAT'S GRANTED. 20 WITH REGARD TO DOCKET NO. 41-2, THAT'S ANOTHER MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY. I WILL LEAVE THAT PENDING, 21 22 MR. FAKHOURY, IS THAT AGREEABLE? 23 MR. FAKHOURY: THAT'S FINE, YOUR HONOR. THAT GOES 24 BACK TO MY MOTION TO DISMISS. I THINK THE COURT'S ALREADY 25 ADDRESSED THAT.

THE COURT: WITH REGARD TO DOCKET 41-1, MOTION TO DISMISS ON THE BASIS THE GOVERNMENT ALLEGEDLY DEPORTED EXCULPATORY WITNESSES.

THE FIRST PRONG THERE I HAVE TO LOOK TO SEE WHETHER OR NOT, IN THE COURT'S MIND, THE GOVERNMENT ACTED IN BAD FAITH. QUITE FRANKLY, MR. FAKHOURY, I DON'T SEE ANY INDICATION THEY ACTED IN BAD FAITH. TO ME WHAT IT SHOWED WAS GOOD FAITH THE FACT THEY VIDEOTAPED MS. GARCIA'S INTERVIEW.

YOUR CLIENT DID SIGN A WAIVER.

THE MATERIAL WITNESS THAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT,

MS. GARCIA, HER STATEMENT WITH REGARD TO NOT HEARING YOUR

CLIENT GIVE ANY DIRECTION, IS CUMULATIVE OF WHAT HER

BOYFRIEND, MR. GONZALEZ, SAYS, WHICH WAS HE WAS RETAINED AND

HIS DEPOSITION WAS TAKEN.

AND ALSO, EXHIBIT A, I BELIEVE IT IS, TO YOUR
PAPERS, IS THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE INTERVIEW OF MS. GARCIA, AND
IN ABOUT A PAGE-AND-A-HALF, SPECIFICALLY FROM PAGE 9, LINE
ONE, THROUGH PAGE 10, LINE 15, END RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SHE
SAYS, "I DON'T REMEMBER. I WASN'T LOOKING." AND THEN SHE
SAYS, "I DON'T KNOW, AT LEAST FIVE OCCASIONS." SO, THAT TO
ME IS CERTAINLY NOT SOMEONE WHO'S GOING TO HAVE SOMETHING
THAT'S GOING TO BE MATERIALLY HELPFUL TO THE DEFENSE. IN
FACT, IT APPEARS SHE WAS BEING SOMEWHAT EVASIVE.

IN ANY EVENT, HER BASIC STATEMENTS YOU'RE RELYING
ON SHE DIDN'T HEAR THE CLIENT GIVE ORDERS, WHICH IS PERFECTLY

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

CONSISTENT WITH WHAT MR. GONZALEZ SAID, AND LIKEWISE, DIDN'T HEAR YOUR CLIENT DIRECT THE GROUP OR GIVE ORDERS. ALTHOUGH YOU ARE AWARE IN THE DEPOSITION HE INDICATES HE DID SEE YOUR CLIENT LAY A BLANKET ON THE DIRT ROAD AND ALL THE GROUP WALKED ACROSS THE BLANKET, BUT THAT'S HERE NOR THERE. FOR PURPOSES OF WHETHER OR NOT SHE HAD EXCLUSIVELY SPOKE TOWARDS MR. (INAUDIBLE), I JUST DON'T SEE THAT IT'S THERE. IT'S HARD TO BELIEVE HER TESTIMONY OF, "I DON'T RECALL, AND I WASN'T LOOKING, AND I DON'T REMEMBER," WOULD BE RELEVANT, AND MATERIAL OR ANYTHING, ESPECIALLY SINCE ANYTHING SHE HAD TO SAY OR DID SAY BASICALLY IS CUMULATIVE OF WHAT MR. GONZALEZ SAID. I DON'T THINK THAT'S ALL EXCULPATORY. CERTAINLY, IF ANYTHING, IT'S AN INADEQUATE SHOWING OF THE STATEMENT OF YOUR CLIENT NOT GIVING ANY ORDERS IS EXCULPATORY. MR. FAKHOURY: YOUR HONOR, IF I COULD JUST BRIEFLY ADD A COUPLE OF THINGS? 16 THE COURT: SURE. MR. FAKHOURY: ONE, WITH RESPECT TO THE LUJAN-CASTRO WAIVER, THAT MR. LEAL PURPORTEDLY SIGNED, I DISPUTE 20 THAT AND I DISAGREE WITH MR. MILLER ABOUT IT. I DON'T HAVE A COPY OF THE WAIVER IN DISCOVERY. I RECEIVED ONE FOR THE CO-DEFENDANT, MR. AGUILAR. BUT I NEVER RECEIVED ONE FOR MR. LEAL'S BEHALF. I NOTED THAT THE REPORT OF INVESTIGATION INDICATED 25 THAT MR. LEAL DID GIVE -- DID NOT REQUEST TO RETAIN ANY

MATERIAL WITNESS. AS I ATTACHED TO A DECLARATION, THERE WAS NEVER ANY EXPLANATION AS TO WHAT THE MATERIAL WITNESSES HAD SAID TO HIM.

SO, WITH RESPECT TO THE VALIDITY OF THE

LUJAN-CASTRO WAIVER, I DON'T THINK ANY SUCH WAIVER WOULD BE

VALID IN THIS CASE, EVEN IF ONE EXISTED IN WRITTEN FORM,

WHICH I HAVEN'T SEEN, AND EVEN AN ORAL ONE, I THINK, IS NOT

VALID BECAUSE, AS INDICATED, MR. LEAL'S DECLARATION THERE IS

NO CHANCE FOR HIM TO KNOWINGLY CHOOSE TO EXCISE THAT RIGHT.

WITH RESPECT TO WHETHER MS. GARCIA'S STATEMENTS

WERE CONSISTENT WITH HER BOYFRIEND, AND I THINK IT WAS

MR. GONZALEZ, IF I AM INCORRECT I APOLOGIZE, AGAIN, ALSO YOUR

HONOR, I RESPECTFULLY DISAGREE THAT THEY ARE CONSISTENT. I

THINK THEY ARE INCONSISTENT IN THE SENSE THAT THE OTHER -
I'M SORRY, THE OTHER THREE MATERIAL WITNESSES ALL BASICALLY

POINT THE FINGER AT MR. LEAL SAYING THAT HE WAS DIRECTING AND

SAYING ORDERS, AND MS. GARCIA IN STARCK CONTRAST SAYS, "NO, I

NEVER HEARD THAT."

NOW, I CERTAINLY CAN SEE THE COURT'S CONCERN WITH RESPECT TO MS. GARCIA'S, KIND OF, "I DON'T KNOW, I'M NOT SURE," BUT WITH RESPECT TO THAT SPECIFIC PORTION OF HER INTERVIEW, SHE WAS VERY FIRM AND STEADY. IN FACT, THE AGENTS EVEN ASKED HER, I THINK, SOMETHING TO THE EFFECT OF, "PARDON ME?" AND SHE SAID THE SAME THING, "HE DID NOT DIRECT US."

THEY SAID, "NO?" AND SHE SAID, "NO."

SO, WHATEVER FUZZINESS OR UNCERTAINTY SHE MAY HAVE HAD, IN GENERAL, I THINK, AT LEAST WITH RESPECT TO THIS SPECIFIC PORTION, AND THE MOST RELEVANT AND MOST SIGNIFICANTLY **BRADY** PORTION OF THAT STATEMENT, SHE WAS VERY FIRM AND I THINK SHE WAS CONSISTENT.

AND YOU KNOW, YOUR HONOR, I HATE TO SAY THE

GOVERNMENT ACTS IN BAD FAITH AND JUST THROW IT OUT THERE, BUT

I WOULD NOTE, AGAIN, GOING BACK TO WHAT MR. MILLER SAID

EARLIER, THEY ONLY TAKE STATEMENTS OF MATERIAL WITNESSES

CUSTOMARILY JUST TO EXPEDITE THE REMOVAL, AND IT'S BACKGROUND

IMMIGRATION INFORMATION. I THINK IT'S TELLING THAT THERE ARE

12 INDIVIDUALS APPREHENDED, EIGHT ARE SUMMARILY REMOVED

WITHOUT ANY STATEMENT BEING TAKEN BY THEM AS TO WHAT HAPPENED

IN THE OFFENSE, THREE ARE RETAINED AS MATERIAL WITNESSES, AND

VIDEOTAPED AND THEN WE HAVE MS. GARCIA WHO'S KIND OF IN THE

MIDDLE. THEY TAKE A STATEMENT FROM HER, UNLIKE THE OTHER

EIGHT INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE REMOVED, VIDEOTAPE THE STATEMENT,

LIKE THE THREE OTHER INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE RETAINED, AND

ULTIMATELY DECIDE TO REMOVE HER.

I THINK IT'S THAT ODD SEQUENCE OF EVENTS THAT LEADS

ME TO BELIEVE THAT THERE IS AT LEAST AN INDICATION OF SOME

BAD FAITH, AT A MINIMUM, REQUIRES AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING TO

FURTHER FIGURE OUT WHAT THE AGENT IN THIS CASE IS

CONTEMPLATING DECIDING TO TAKE HER STATEMENT IN CONTRAST TO

THE OTHER EIGHT MATERIALS WITNESSES AND THEN REMOVE HER.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: WHEN YOU READ THE TRANSCRIPTS, MR. FAKHOURY, YOU CAN SEE THAT SHE AND HER BOYFRIEND, MR. GONZALEZ, WHO THEY DID KEEP, ARE KIND OF IN THE MIDDLE OF THE GROUP. AND IT IS CERTAINLY CLEAR THAT SHE SAID, "NO," REFERRING TO YOUR CLIENT, ASKED ABOUT NO. 5 WHO ALLEGEDLY IS YOUR CLIENT, THAT NO, SHE SAID, "NO, HE DIDN'T GIVE ANY ORDERS." THE AGENT SAYS, "PARDON ME?" SHE AGAIN REPEATS, "NO, HE DID NOT GIVE ORDERS." THAT'S EXACTLY CONSISTENT WITH WHAT MS. GONZALEZ SAID, THAT, "NO, HE DIDN'T GIVE ANY ORDERS, "OR, "DID YOUR CLIENT GIVE ANY ORDERS?" IT'S A LITTLE DIFFERENT THAN WHAT YOUR CLIENT HAS IN HIS DECLARATION THAT HE CONTRIBUTES TO YOU THAT YOU TOLD HIM THAT MS. GARCIA SAID THAT HE WAS GUIDING THE GROUP. WELL, GUIDING THE GROUP CAN BE LOTS OF THINGS BESIDES HEARING HIM GIVING ORDERS. I THINK YOUR CLIENT HAD A LITTLE MISAPPREHENSION AS TO EXACTLY WHAT WAS SAID. IN ANY EVENT, WHAT MR. GARCIA SAID IN HIS DEPOSITION, WHAT MR. GONZALEZ SAID IN HIS DEPOSITION, AND WHAT MS. GARCIA SAID IN HER INTERVIEW ARE DEFINITELY CONSISTENT, AND CUMULATIVE, AND UNDERSTANDABLE BASED ON THEIR POSITION IN THE GROUP. THEY WERE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE GROUP. SO, UNDERSTANDING THERE WERE A LOT OF PEOPLE UP CLOSER TO THE FRONT WHERE YOUR CLIENT ALLEGEDLY WAS, MAY HAVE HEARD SOMETHING, OR MAYBE PEOPLE THOUGHT IT WOULD GET BACK TO HIM.

MR. FAKHOURY: I CERTAINLY UNDERSTAND THE COURT'S

1 POINT. I THINK MY RECORD HAS BEEN MADE. 2 THE COURT: OKAY. FOR THE REASONS I ALREADY STATED, THE REQUEST FOR THE MOTION TO DISMISS THE INDICTMENT 3 BECAUSE OF GOVERNMENT DEPORTS EXCULPATORY WITNESSES IS DENIED 4 ON THE BASIS I DON'T FIND THE GOVERNMENT ACTED IN BAD FAITH, 5 AND I DON'T FIND THE GOVERNMENT'S WITNESS WAS AN EXCULPATORY 6 7 WITNESS, WOULD BE A RETAINED WITNESS SPECIFICALLY WITH REGARD TO MR. GONZALEZ. 8 9 WITH REGARD TO A TRIAL DATE, DO YOU WANT TO GO OFF 10 THE RECORD AND DISCUSS A DATE? I CAN SUGGEST DATES. MR. MILLER: I'M UNAVAILABLE THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 11 12 27TH. I HAVE A TRIAL SCHEDULED. THE COURT: HOW ABOUT OCTOBER 5TH? 13 14 MR. CARRIEDO: YOUR HONOR, I'M COMING BACK ON 15 OCTOBER 5. THE COURT: THAT'S RIGHT, FROM THIS MORNING, I'M 16 17 SORRY. I SHOULD HAVE REMEMBERED THAT. 18 MR. CARRIEDO: AND I WOULD ASK THAT WE NOT START A 19 TRIAL THAT WEEK. 20 THE COURT: CERTAINLY. ABSOLUTELY, MR. CARRIEDO, NO PROBLEM AT ALL. WHY DON'T YOU GUYS GO OFF THE RECORD AND 21 22 TALK ABOUT IT, GIVE ME AN IDEA --23 (DISCUSSION HAD OFF THE RECORD.) 24 MR. FAKHOURY: YOUR HONOR, OCTOBER 12TH, IF THAT'S 25 AVAILABLE TO THE COURT?

1 THE COURT: NO, THAT'S NOT GOOD. I JUST SET ONE FOR THE END OF OCTOBER. IT PROBABLY WOULD HAVE TO GO INTO 2 NOVEMBER. HOW ABOUT THE 16TH? MY CLERK SUGGESTS THAT. MR. MILLER: I HAVE A TRIAL SCHEDULED FOR THE 2ND. 4 IN THE LAND OF RATIONAL THOUGHT, IT WOULD BE DONE THAT WEEK, 5 BUT IT INVOLVES A BORDER PATROL SHOOTING. 6 7 THE COURT: THAT WOULD BE TWO WEEKS AFTER THAT, THAT SHOULDN'T BE A PROBLEM. 8 9 MR. MILLER: OKAY. 10 THE COURT: MR. CARRIEDO, YOU ARE AVAILABLE? MR. CARRIEDO: THAT'S FINE. 11 THE COURT: MR. FAKHOURY? 12 MR. FAKHOURY: I'M AVAILABLE, YOUR HONOR. MY ONLY 13 CONCERN IT'S PRETTY FAR SINCE MR. LEAL HAS BEEN IN CUSTODY 14 15 SINCE MARCH, BUT IF THAT'S THE ONLY DATE THAT WORKS --16 THE COURT: I CAN TRY IT SOONER IF YOU WANT TO LOOK 17 FOR SOMETHING IN SEPTEMBER? 18 MR. FAKHOURY: MY ONLY PROBLEM WITH SEPTEMBER IS I 19 HAVE THREE STRAIGHT WEEKS OF TRIALS. I GUESS NOVEMBER 16TH 20 IS THE ONLY DATE THAT WORKS. THAT'S FINE. THE COURT: WHAT'S WRONG WITH OCTOBER 5TH? WHO 21 22 COULDN'T DO -- MR. CARRIEDO IS NOT AVAILABLE. 23 MR. CARRIEDO: I'M NOT IN THE DISTRICT. 24 MR. FAKHOURY: I DON'T KNOW IF THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 25 18TH, OR EVEN THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 25TH --

1 MR. MILLER: I HAVE A TRIAL SCHEDULED FOR THE 26TH. 2 THAT WAS ONE YOU SET AND THEN TRANSFERRED TO JUDGE HAYES. 3 THE COURT: I'M NOT AVAILABLE THE WEEK OF THE 18TH EITHER. OKAY. NOVEMBER 16TH LOOKS LIKE THAT'S THE BEST WE 4 CAN DO. 5 MR. MILLER: VERY WELL. 6 7 THE COURT: IF ANYTHING OPENS UP ON YOUR PERSPECTIVE SCHEDULES, JUST CONTACT MY CLERK AND WE WILL TRY 8 9 TO MOVE IT UP. 10 MR. FAKHOURY: THAT'S FINE, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: MR. CARRIEDO, IS THAT AGREEABLE? 11 12 MR. CARRIEDO: YES. MR. FAKHOURY: THAT'S FOR TRIAL? IN LIM'S -- THE 13 14 16TH WOULD ALSO BE IN LIM'S? 15 THE COURT: YES. MR. LEAL-DEL CARMEN, IS THAT DATE ALL RIGHT WITH YOU, SIR? 16 17 DEFT. LEAL: WELL, YES. 18 THE COURT: MR. GOMEZ? 19 DEFT. GOMEZ: YES. 20 THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU, GENTLEMEN. 21 MR. FAKHOURY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 22 THE COURT: YOU ARE WELCOME. 23 (WHICH WERE ALL THE PROCEEDINGS 24 HELD IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED CAUSE.) 25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 2 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO 4 ) SS. 5 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 6 7 I, MELISSA A. PIERSON, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER, REGISTERED 8 PROFESSIONAL REPORTER, IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT 9 COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY 10 CERTIFY THAT I REPORTED, STENOGRAPHICALLY, THE FOREGOING 11 PROCEEDINGS AT THE TIME AND PLACE HEREINBEFORE SET FORTH; 12 THAT THE SAME WAS THEREAFTER REDUCED TO TYPEWRITTEN FORM BY 13 MEANS OF COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION; AND I DO FURTHER 14 CERTIFY THAT THIS IS A TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPTION OF MY 15 STENOGRAPHIC NOTES. 16 17 18 DATE: 4-28-11 19 20 S:/MELISSA A. PIERSON 21 MELISSA A. PIERSON, CSR 12499 RPR 22 FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER 23 2.4 25